arXiv:1411.7531v1 [math.PR] 27 Nov 2014

Lyapunov exponents for branching processes in a random environment: The effect of information

Sophie Hautphenne* Guy Latouche†

December 1, 2014

Abstract

We consider multitype Markovian branching processes evolving in a Markovian random environment. To determine whether or not the branching process becomes extinct almost surely is akin to computing the maximal Lyapunov exponent of a sequence of random matrices, which is a notoriously difficult problem. We define dual processes and we construct bounds for the Lyapunov exponent. The bounds are obtained by adding or by removing information: to add information results in a lower bound, to remove information results in an upper bound and we show that to add more information gives smaller lower bounds. We give a few illustrative examples and we observe that the upper bound is generally more accurate than the lower bound.

1 Introduction

We consider an irreducible multitype Markovian branching process with r types of individuals and we assume that its parameters vary over time according to a Markovian random environment $\{X(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$. This is

*The University of Melbourne, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Victoria 3010, Australia; sophiemh@unimelb.edu.au

†Université Libre de Bruxelles, Département d'Informatique, CP 212, Boulevard du Triomphe, 1050 Bruxelles, Belgium; latouche@ulb.ac.be

an irreducible continuous-time Markov chain on the finite state space $E = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$

In the absence of a random environment, the parameters of the branching process stay constant over time, and an individual of type i ($1 \leq i \leq r$) lives for an exponentially distributed amount of time, after which it generates a random number of children of each type j, $1 \leq j \leq r$. It is well known (Athreya and Ney [2]) that the mean population size matrix $M(t)$, for which $M_{ij}(t)$ is the conditional expected number of individuals of type j alive at time t, given that the population starts at time 0 with one single individual of type i, is given by $M(t) = e^{\Omega t}$ for some matrix Ω with nonnegative off-diagonal elements. Furthermore, extinction of the branching process occurs with probability one if and only if $\lambda \leq 0$, where λ is the eigenvalue of maximal real part of Ω.

Here, we associate a matrix Ω_ℓ to each environmental state ℓ, $\ell = 1, \ldots, m$, and the process $\{X(t)\}$ controls the parameters of the multitype branching process in such a way that the mean population size matrix is $M_\ell(t) := e^{\Omega_\ell t}$ during intervals of time over which $X(\cdot) = \ell$.

The following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the almost sure extinction of the branching process in a Markovian random environment. The notation is as follows: $\hat{\Omega}_k = \Omega_{\hat{X}_k}$ where $\{\hat{X}_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is the jump chain associated with the random environment $\{X(t)\}$, and $\{\xi_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is the sequence of sojourn times in the successive environmental states.

Theorem 1.1. (Tanny [12, Theorem 9.10]) *There exists a constant ω such that*

$$\omega = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log\{e^{\hat{\Omega}_0 \xi_0}\, e^{\hat{\Omega}_1 \xi_1}\, \cdots\, e^{\hat{\Omega}_{n-1}\xi_{n-1}}\}_{ij} \tag{1}$$

almost surely, independently of i and j. Extinction is almost sure if and only if $\omega \leq 0$.

The (i, j)th entry of the random matrix product in (1) is the conditional expected number of individuals of type j alive just before the nth environmental state change, given that the population starts at time 0 with one single individual of type i and given the history of the environmental process. The limit ω may be interpreted as the asymptotic growth rate of the

population, and it takes different forms since one also has

$$\begin{aligned}\omega &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\log\{e^{\hat{\Omega}_0\xi_0}\,e^{\hat{\Omega}_1\xi_1}\,\cdots\,e^{\hat{\Omega}_{n-1}\xi_{n-1}}\}_{ij} \quad \text{for all } i,\, j, \qquad (2)\\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log||e^{\hat{\Omega}_0\xi_0}\,e^{\hat{\Omega}_1\xi_1}\,\cdots\,e^{\hat{\Omega}_{n-1}\xi_{n-1}}||\\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\log||e^{\hat{\Omega}_0\xi_0}\,e^{\hat{\Omega}_1\xi_1}\,\cdots\,e^{\hat{\Omega}_{n-1}\xi_{n-1}}||, \qquad (3)\end{aligned}$$

independently of the matrix norm, as shown in Athreya and Karlin [1], and in Kingman [9].

The parameter ω may be likened to a Lyapunov exponent: given a set of real matrices $\mathcal{A} = \{A_k : k \geq 1\}$ and a probability distribution $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathcal{A}$, the maximal Lyapunov exponent ρ for $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbb{P}$ is defined to be

$$\rho(\mathcal{A},\mathbb{P}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} 1/n\,\mathbb{E}\log||A_1\ldots A_n||,$$

where A_k, $k \geq 1$, are independent and identically distributed random matrices on $\mathcal{A}$ with the distribution $\mathbb{P}$; the limit exists and does not depend on the choice of matrix norm (Furstenberg and Kesten [4], Oseledec [11]). In our case, $\mathcal{A} = \{e^{\Omega x} : \Omega \in \{\Omega_1,\ldots,\Omega_m\}, x \geq 0\}$, the probability distribution $\mathbb{P}$ is induced by the random environment, and the matrices A_k are not independent nor identically distributed.

Lyapunov exponents are hard to compute (Kingman [9], Tsitsiklis and Blondel [13]), except under very special circumstances, such as in Key [7] where the matrices in the family are assumed to be simultaneously diagonalizable, or in Lima and Rahibe [10] where $\mathcal{A}$ contains two matrices of order 2 only, one of which is singular. For a thorough survey on the basics of Lyapunov exponents, we refer to Watkins [14].

If $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite set of nonnegative matrices, Gharavi and Anantharam [5] give an upper bound for $\rho(\mathcal{A},\mathbb{P})$ in the form of the maximum of a nonlinear concave function. Key [8] gives both upper and lower bounds determined as follows, on the basis of (2, 3). Define $\sigma_n = 1/n\,\mathbb{E}\log||A_1\cdots A_n||$ and $\sigma_n^* = 1/n\,\mathbb{E}\log\{A_1\cdots A_n\}_{jj}$ for some arbitrarily fixed j. One verifies that $\{\sigma_{2^k}\}$ is non-increasing and that $\{\sigma^*_{2^k}\}$ is non-decreasing, so that these form sequences of upper and lower bounds for ω. They are, however, not much easier to compute than the Lyapunov exponent itself.

In the absence of an easily computed exact expression for ω, we look for upper and lower bounds, in an adaptation of the approach developed in [6] for

branching processes subject to binomial catastrophes at random times. Our bounds are obtained in three steps. First, we replace the branching process by a dual, marked Markovian process. This has the advantage that we deal with the trajectories of a simple continuous-time Markov chain, instead of the conditional expected number of individuals in each type of the original branching process. Next, we take the expectation with respect to the $\hat{X}_k$s and the ξ_ks, and obtain an upper bound for ω. In the third step, we add some information about the history of the dual process and so obtain a lower bound. In some cases, we have some leeway in the amount of information that we need to add to obtain a lower bound, and we show that the bound is smaller when we add more information. Thus, roughly speaking, we may say that the conditional expectation in (1) is taken with respect to a finely balanced information; less information leads to an upper bound, while more information yields a lower bound.

Our approach may be used for the analysis of other systems, beyond branching processes. For instance, Bolthausen and Goldsheid analyse in [3] a random walk on a strip subject to a random environment and their parameter λ in [3, Equation 6] is a Lyapunov exponent. Such expressions typically arise in the analysis of systems in random environments and should be amenable to an approach similar to ours.

The paper is organised as follows. The dual process and the marks are defined in Section 2 and we determine an upper and a lower bounds for ω. We discuss in Section 3 an alternative definition of the dual Markov chain: this second dual yields the same upper bound but a different lower bound. We give two illustrative examples in Section 4, showing that the ordering of the lower bounds depends on the case. We show in Section 5 how the lower bound may be increased in the special circumstance where the environmental process $\{X(t)\}$ is cyclic. Finally, we prove in Section 6 that our bounds are tight.

2 Dual process

We denote by Q the generator of the environmental process $\{X(t)\}$ and by $c_\ell = |Q_{\ell\ell}|$, for $1 \leq \ell \leq m$, the parameters of the exponential distributions of sojourn times in the different environmental states.

We assume that the matrices Ω_ℓ, $1 \leq \ell \leq m$, are all irreducible. Then, each matrix has an eigenvalue λ_ℓ of maximal real part, which is the asymp-

totic growth rate of the population under the conditions prevailing while the environmental process is in state ℓ. The matrices Ω_ℓ^* defined by $\Omega_\ell^* = \Omega_\ell - \lambda_\ell I$ have each one eigenvalue equal to zero, the other eigenvalues having a strictly negative real part. Furthermore, the corresponding left- and right-eigenvectors $\boldsymbol{u}_\ell$ and $\boldsymbol{v}_\ell$ are strictly positive and may be normalised by $\boldsymbol{u}_\ell \mathbf{1} = 1$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_\ell \boldsymbol{v}_\ell = 1$.

We proceed in two steps. Firstly, we write (1) as

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} [\lambda_1 \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \xi_k^{(1)} + \ldots + \lambda_m \sum_{k=1}^{n_m} \xi_k^{(m)}] \\ &\quad + \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log\{e^{\hat{\Omega}_0^* \xi_0} \, e^{\hat{\Omega}_1^* \xi_1} \, \cdots \, e^{\hat{\Omega}_{n-1}^* \xi_{n-1}}\}_{ij} \qquad \text{a.s.,} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $n_\ell = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{X}_k = j\}}$ is the number of times the environment visits state ℓ during the first n environmental transitions, $\hat{\Omega}_k^* = \Omega_{\hat{X}_k}^*$, and $\xi_k^{(\ell)}$ is the length of the kth sojourn interval in state ℓ.

The random variables $\{\xi_k^{(\ell)}, k \geq 1\}$ are independent and exponentially distributed with parameter c_ℓ, so that the sum $\sum_{k=1}^{n_\ell} \xi_k^{(\ell)}/n_\ell$ converges almost surely to $\mathbb{E}[\xi^{(\ell)}] = 1/c_\ell$ by the Strong Law of Large Numbers. For the same reason, $n_\ell/n \to \hat{\pi}_\ell$ with probability one as $n \to \infty$, for all ℓ, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ is the stationary distribution of the jump chain $\{\hat{X}_k\}$. Therefore, we may write (4) as

$$\omega = (\lambda_1 \hat{\pi}_1/c_1 + \ldots + \lambda_m \hat{\pi}_m/c_m) + \Psi \tag{5}$$

where Ψ is a constant such that

$$\Psi = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log\{e^{\hat{\Omega}_0^* \xi_0} \, e^{\hat{\Omega}_1^* \xi_1} \, \cdots \, e^{\hat{\Omega}_{n-1}^* \xi_{n-1}}\}_{ij} \qquad \text{a.s.} \tag{6}$$

In the second step, we define $\Delta_\ell = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{v}_\ell)$ and

$$\Theta_\ell = \Delta_\ell^{-1} \, \Omega_\ell^* \, \Delta_\ell, \qquad \text{for } 1 \leq \ell \leq m. \tag{7}$$

It is easy to verify for each ℓ that Θ_ℓ is a generator: it has nonnegative off-diagonal elements and the row sums are equal to zero, so that the diagonal elements are strictly negative. We have $e^{\Omega_\ell^*} = \Delta_\ell \, e^{\Theta_\ell} \, \Delta_\ell^{-1}$, so that

$$\Psi = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log\{\hat{\Delta}_0 \, e^{\hat{\Theta}_0 \xi_0} \, \hat{\Delta}_0^{-1} \, \hat{\Delta}_1 \, e^{\hat{\Theta}_1 \xi_1} \, \hat{\Delta}_1^{-1} \, \cdots \, \hat{\Delta}_{n-1} \, e^{\hat{\Theta}_{n-1} \xi_{n-1}} \, \hat{\Delta}_{n-1}^{-1}\}_{ij} \tag{8}$$

almost surely, where $\hat{\Delta}_k = \Delta_{\hat{X}_k}$ and $\hat{\Theta}_k = \Theta_{\hat{X}_k}$.

While the probabilistic interpretation of the matrix product in (6) is not obvious, we can easily give one to the equivalent random matrix product in (8): we replace the whole branching process by a two-dimensional Markov chain $\{(X(t), \varphi(t)) : t \geq 0\}$ on the state space $\{1 \dots m\} \times \{1 \dots r\}$, with generator

$$Q_\Theta = Q \otimes I_r + \begin{bmatrix} \Theta_1 & & & \\ & \Theta_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \Theta_m \end{bmatrix},$$

where I_r is the identity matrix of size r (we indicate the size of I when it is not clear by the context). Like before, $\{X(t)\}$ is a Markov chain with generator Q and the dual process $\{\varphi(t)\}$ evolves according to the generator Θ_ℓ as long as $X(\cdot)$ remains equal to ℓ. We define as follows the epochs $\{\tau_k : k = 0, 1, \dots\}$ of transition for the component $X(\cdot)$ of the process:

$$\tau_0 = 0, \qquad \tau_{k+1} = \tau_k + \xi_k, \quad k \geq 0,$$

and we define the process $\{\varphi_k, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with $\varphi_k = \varphi(\tau_k)$, *embedded* at the jump epochs for $\{X(t)\}$. Finally, we associate a sequence $\{Z_k : k = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ of marks to the intervals $[\tau_k, \tau_{k+1})$, with

$$Z_k = (\hat{\Delta}_k)_{\varphi_k} (\hat{\Delta}_k^{-1})_{\varphi_{k+1}} = \frac{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_k})_{\varphi_k}}{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_k})_{\varphi_{k+1}}}, \tag{9}$$

for $k \geq 0$.

Lemma 2.1. *The parameter ω may be written as*

$$\omega = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} C^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \Psi \tag{10}$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ is the stationary probability vector of the environmental jump chain $\{\hat{X}_k\}$, $C = \mathrm{diag}(c_1, \dots, c_m)$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)^\top$, and

$$\Psi = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}[Z_0 \, Z_1 \cdots Z_{n-1} \, \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi_n = j\}} \mid \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}] \qquad a.s., \tag{11}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)} = (\xi_0, \dots, \xi_{n-1})$, and $\hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)} = (\hat{X}_0, \dots, \hat{X}_{n-1})$.

Proof. Equation (10) is merely (5) written in a more compact manner. Furthermore, one has

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_k \, \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi_{k+1} = j\}} \mid \varphi_k = i, \xi_k, \hat{X}_k] = (\hat{\Delta}_k e^{\hat{\Theta}_k \xi_k} \hat{\Delta}_k^{-1})_{ij}, \quad k \geq 0,$$

and a simple calculation shows that (8) and (11) are equivalent. □

We recognise in the first term of (10) the expected long-term growth rate of the population, while the second term reflects the fact that changes in the environment influence all individuals simultaneously. The advantage of (11) over (8) is that we now deal with a product of scalar random variables instead of a product of random matrices. In the sequel, we shall occasionally use the notation

$$\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} = Z_0 Z_1 \cdots Z_{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi_n = j\}} \tag{12}$$

in order to simplify the presentation of a few arguments.

Now, we proceed like in [6]: we condition on less information to find an upper bound, and we condition on more information to find a lower bound.

2.1 Upper bound

To simplify the notation, we define the matrices

$$M_\ell = c_\ell \, \Delta_\ell (c_\ell I - \Theta_\ell)^{-1} \, \Delta_\ell^{-1} = c_\ell [(c_\ell + \lambda_\ell) I - \Omega_\ell]^{-1}, \tag{13}$$

for $\ell = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, and the matrix

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & & & \\ & M_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & M_m \end{bmatrix} \tag{14}$$

of order rm. We also define the transition matrix $\hat{P} = I + C^{-1}Q$ of the jump chain $\{\hat{X}_k\}$.

Theorem 2.2. *An upper bound for ω is given by ω_U with*

$$\omega_U = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} C^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \log \mathrm{sp}[M(\hat{P} \otimes I_r)].$$

Proof. From (11, 12), we have $e^\Psi = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}]^{1/n}$ a.s. Taking on both sides expectations with respect to $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} e^\Psi &= \mathbb{E}\left[\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}]^{1/n}\right] \\ &\le \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}]^{1/n}\right] \\ &\le \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}]\right]^{1/n} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i]^{1/n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Fatou's Lemma, and the second follows from Jensen's Inequality for concave functions.

By conditioning on $\hat{X}_0$ and ξ_0, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[Z_0 \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi_1=j\}} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i] &= \sum_{1\le\ell\le m} \alpha_\ell \int_0^\infty \left[\Delta_\ell e^{\Theta_\ell t}\, \Delta_\ell^{-1}\right]_{ij} c_\ell e^{-c_\ell t}\, dt \\ &= \sum_{1\le\ell\le m} \alpha_\ell \left[c_\ell\, \Delta_\ell (c_\ell I - \Theta_\ell)^{-1}\, \Delta_\ell^{-1}\right]_{ij} \\ &= [(\boldsymbol{\alpha}\otimes I_r) M (\mathbf{1}\otimes I_r)]_{ij}\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is the initial probability vector of $\{X(t)\}$, and the vector $\mathbf{1}$ is of size m. By induction, one shows that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i] = \Big[(\boldsymbol{\alpha}\otimes I_r)[M(\hat{P}\otimes I_r)]^n(\mathbf{1}\otimes I_r)\Big]_{ij},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}e^{\Psi} &\le \lim_{n\to\infty} \Big[(\boldsymbol{\alpha}\otimes I_r)[M(\hat{P}\otimes I_r)]^n(\mathbf{1}\otimes I_r)\Big]_{ij}^{1/n} \\ &= \mathrm{sp}[M(\hat{P}\otimes I_r)],\end{aligned}$$

independently of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, i, and j. □

2.2 Lower bound

To obtain a lower bound, we reverse the argument of Theorem 2.2: we start from a conditional expectation given *more* information. To make use of the definition (9) of the marks, we need to consider two discrete-time Markov chains $\{Y_k^{(1)}\}$ and $\{Y_k^{(2)}\}$ embedded at the epochs $\{\tau_k\}$, with $Y_k^{(1)} = (\hat{X}_k, \varphi_k)$ and $Y_k^{(2)} = (\hat{X}_k, \varphi_{k+1})$. For $\{Y_k^{(1)}\}$, a transition from (ℓ, i) to (ℓ', j) has probability

$$P^{(1)}_{(\ell,i),(\ell',j)} = \int_0^\infty \left(e^{\Theta_\ell t}\right)_{ij} c_\ell e^{-c_\ell t} dt\, \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'} = (N_\ell)_{ij}\hat{P}_{\ell\ell'}$$

where

$$N_\ell = c_\ell(c_\ell I - \Theta_\ell)^{-1} = \Delta_\ell^{-1} M_\ell \Delta_\ell. \tag{15}$$

A similar calculation shows that $P^{(2)}_{(\ell,i),(\ell',j)} = \hat{P}_{\ell\ell'}(N_{\ell'})_{ij}$ and we write

$$P^{(1)} = N(\hat{P}\otimes I_r), \qquad P^{(2)} = (\hat{P}\otimes I_r)N,$$

with

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} N_1 & & & \\ & N_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & N_m \end{bmatrix}.$$

Theorem 2.3. *A lower bound for ω is given by ω_L with*

$$\omega_L = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} C^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(1)} (I - N) \log \bar{\boldsymbol{v}}, \tag{16}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(1)}$ is the stationary probability vector of $P^{(1)}$ and

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{v}} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{v}_1 \\ \boldsymbol{v}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{v}_m \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. We start from the conditional expectation of the product of marks, given $\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(n)} = (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_{n-1})$ in addition to $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}$. We readily find from (9) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(n)}, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}] \\ &\quad = \frac{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_0})_i}{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_0})_{\varphi_1}} \frac{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_1})_{\varphi_1}}{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_1})_{\varphi_2}} \cdots \frac{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_{n-2}})_{\varphi_{n-2}}}{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_{n-2}})_{\varphi_{n-1}}} \frac{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_{n-1}})_{\varphi_{n-1}}}{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_{n-1}})_j} \left(e^{\hat{\Theta}_{n-1}\xi_{n-1}}\right)_{\varphi_{n-1},j} \\ &\quad = \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{a=1}^{r} (\boldsymbol{v}_\ell)_a^{n^{(1)}_{(\ell,a)} - n^{(2)}_{(\ell,a)}} \frac{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_0})_i}{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_{n-1}})_j} \left(e^{\hat{\Theta}_{n-1}\xi_{n-1}}\right)_{\varphi_{n-1},j}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$n^{(1)}_{(\ell,a)} = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_k^{(1)} = (\ell,a)\}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad n^{(2)}_{(\ell,a)} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_k^{(2)} = (\ell,a)\}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(n)}, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}]^{1/n} \\ &\quad = \lim_{n\to\infty} \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{a=1}^{r} (\boldsymbol{v}_\ell)_a^{\frac{n^{(1)}_{(\ell,a)} - n^{(2)}_{(\ell,a)}}{n}} \left(\frac{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_0})_i}{(\boldsymbol{v}_{\hat{X}_{n-1}})_j} \left(e^{\hat{\Theta}_{n-1}\xi_{n-1}}\right)_{\varphi_{n-1},j} \right)^{1/n} \\ &\quad = \prod_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{a=1}^{r} (\boldsymbol{v}_\ell)_a^{\pi^{(1)}_{(\ell,a)} - \pi^{(2)}_{(\ell,a)}} \qquad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(1)}$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(2)}$ are the stationary distribution vectors of the stochastic matrices $P^{(1)}$ and $P^{(2)}$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\Psi} &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}]^{1/n} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\varphi}\left[\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(n)}, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}]\right]^{1/n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the outermost expectation is with respect to $\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(n)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{\varphi}\left[\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(n)}, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}]^{1/n}\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\varphi}\left[\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(n)}, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}, \hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^{(n)}]^{1/n}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where we use Jensen's Inequality followed by Fatou's Lemma.

From (10), (17) and (18) , we find that

$$\omega_L = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} C^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda} + (\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(2)}) \log \bar{\boldsymbol{v}}.$$

Finally, it is easy to verify that $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(1)} N$, which concludes the proof. □

3 Alternative dual process

Instead of using the right-eigenvectors of the matrices Ω_ℓ like in (7), one may set up another dual process, starting from the left-eigenvectors. Define $\Delta'_\ell = \mathrm{diag}(\boldsymbol{u}_\ell)$ and

$$\Theta'_\ell = (\Delta'_\ell)^{-1} \, (\Omega^*_\ell)^T \, \Delta'_\ell \qquad \text{for } 1 \leq \ell \leq m.$$

With these, one shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi \;=\; \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \Big\{ &\bar{\Delta}_{n-1} \, e^{\bar{\Theta}_{n-1}\xi_{n-1}} \, \bar{\Delta}_{n-1}^{-1} \, \bar{\Delta}_{n-2} \, e^{\bar{\Theta}_{n-2}\xi_{n-2}} \, \bar{\Delta}_{n-2}^{-1} \cdots \\ &\bar{\Delta}_0 \, e^{\bar{\Theta}_0 \xi_0} \, \bar{\Delta}_0^{-1} \Big\}_{ji}, \qquad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where $\bar{\Delta}_k = \Delta'_{\hat{X}_k}$ and $\bar{\Theta}_k = \Theta'_{\hat{X}_k}$. We define $\{\widetilde{X}_k\}$ as the *time-reversed* version of the environmental jump chain, with transition matrix

$$\widetilde{P} = \mathrm{diag}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}})^{-1} \hat{P}^T \mathrm{diag}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}),$$

and we rewrite (19) as

$$\Psi = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \left\{ \widetilde{\Delta}_0 \, e^{\widetilde{\Theta}_0 \eta_0} \, \widetilde{\Delta}_0^{-1} \, \widetilde{\Delta}_1 \, e^{\widetilde{\Theta}_1 \eta_1} \, \widetilde{\Delta}_1^{-1} \, \cdots \, \widetilde{\Delta}_{n-1} \, e^{\widetilde{\Theta}_{n-1} \eta_{n-1}} \, \widetilde{\Delta}_{n-1}^{-1} \right\}_{ji}, \tag{20}$$

with probability one, where $\widetilde{\Delta}_k = \Delta'_{\widetilde{X}_k}$, $\widetilde{\Theta}_k = \Theta'_{\widetilde{X}_k}$ and η_k is exponential with parameter $c_{\widetilde{X}_k}$.

We follow the same steps as in Section 2 and obtain a new lower bound; we omit the proof here.

Theorem 3.1. *An alternative lower bound for ω is given by*

$$\widetilde{\omega}_L = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} C^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^{(1)} (I - \widetilde{N}) \log \bar{\boldsymbol{u}}^T,$$

where

$$\widetilde{N} = \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{N}_1 & & & \\ & \widetilde{N}_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \widetilde{N}_m \end{bmatrix},$$
$$\widetilde{N}_\ell = c_\ell (c_\ell I - \Theta'_\ell)^{-1},$$

the vector $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}^{(1)}$ is the stationary probability vector of $\widetilde{P}^{(1)} = \widetilde{N}(\widetilde{P} \otimes I_r)$ and

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{u}} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{u}_1 & \boldsymbol{u}_2 & \dots & \boldsymbol{u}_m \end{bmatrix}.$$

□

If we repeat from (20) the argument from Theorem 2.2, we find that $\omega \le \widetilde{\omega}_U$, with

$$\widetilde{\omega}_U = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} C^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \log \mathrm{sp}[M^T (\widetilde{P} \otimes I_r)].$$

This is not a new upper bound, however, as $\omega_U = \widetilde{\omega}_U$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{sp}[M^T (\widetilde{P} \otimes I_r)] &= \mathrm{sp}[M^T (\Delta_\pi^{-1} \otimes I_r)(\hat{P}^T \otimes I_r)(\Delta_\pi \otimes I_r)], \quad \text{with } \Delta_\pi = \mathrm{diag}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}}) \\ &= \mathrm{sp}[(\Delta_\pi \otimes I_r) M^T (\Delta_\pi^{-1} \otimes I_r)(\hat{P}^T \otimes I_r)], \end{aligned}$$

as the spectral radius of a product of matrices is invariant under a cyclic permutation of the factors. The first three factors are block-diagonal matrices and a simple calculation shows that they commute, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{sp}[M^T (\widetilde{P} \otimes I_r)] &= \mathrm{sp}[M^T (\hat{P}^T \otimes I_r)] \\ &= \mathrm{sp}[(\hat{P} \otimes I_r) M] = \mathrm{sp}[M (\hat{P} \otimes I_r)]. \end{aligned}$$

The lower bounds, on the other hand, are obtained from different vectors, and numerical experimentation has shown that they may indeed be very different, without one being generally closer to ω. This is illustrated in the next section.

4 Numerical examples

In this section, we illustrate our bounds with help of two examples. The value of ω as defined in (1) is approximated by simulating 2000 paths of the branching process for n environmental transitions, with n taking values up to 2000; we denote this approximation by ω_{sim}.

Example 4.1 (A two-state random environment). In our first example, $m = 2$ and the generator of $\{X(t)\}$ is

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} -5 & 5 \\ 2 & -2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Its stationary distribution is $\boldsymbol{\pi} = [0.2857, 0.7143]$. We take $r = 2$ and

$$\Omega_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -15 & 12 \\ 9 & -29 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Omega_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -13 & 16 \\ 23 & -12 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{21}$$

The dominant eigenvalues of Ω_1 and Ω_2 are $\lambda_1 = -9.47$ and $\lambda_2 = 6.69$ respectively, so the branching process is subcritical in state 1 and supercritical in state 2. As $\pi_2 > \pi_1$, we expect the whole process to be supercritical and this is confirmed by our results, summarised in the table below and in Figure 1.

ω_L	$\widetilde{\omega}_L$	ω_{sim}	ω_U
0.6107	0.6867	0.6933	0.6964

The simulation results are presented in Figure 1: the plain line is the average, over 2000 simulated paths, of the right-hand side of (1), one does see its convergence as n increases. The upper and lower dashed lines are for ω_U and ω_L. Clearly, ω is positive. For this example, ω_L is not very good and $\widetilde{\omega}_L$ gives a better lower bound.



Figure 1: Plain line: simulations of ω (Cesaro sequence) for successive values of n; lower dashed line: ω_L; upper dashed line: ω_U.

Example 4.2 (A three-state random environment). We add a third state to the random environment and we assume the following generator

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} -4 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 2 & 4 & -6 \end{bmatrix},$$

with stationary distribution $\boldsymbol{\pi} = [0.2143, 0.7143, 0.0714]$. The matrices Ω_1 and Ω_2 are the same as in Example 4.1, and the third is

$$\Omega_3 = \begin{bmatrix} -39 & 12 \\ 3 & -17 \end{bmatrix} \tag{22}$$

with $\lambda_3 = -15.47$, so the branching process is very subcritical in the new environmental state. In this case, we obtain the following values.

$\widetilde{\omega}_L$	ω_L	ω_{sim}	ω_U
0.5725	0.6442	0.7181	0.7475

We represent the bounds and the simulation in Figure 2. For this example, the better lower bound is ω_L.

The examples have been chosen so that the environment spends asymptotically the same amount of time in the supercritical state 2 (the stationary probability is $\pi_2 = 0.7143$ in both cases). In addition, state 3 is more subcritical than state 1. Nevertheless, ω is greater, the branching process is overall more supercritical, in the second example. It is worth mentioning that we have generally observed in our experimentation that the upper bound is more accurate than the lower bounds.



Figure 2: Plain line: simulations of ω (Cesaro sequence) for successive values of n; lower dashed line: ω_L; upper dashed line: ω_U.

5 Adding less information

The lower bound ω_L is obtained by adding information in the form of *all* successive states of the embedded dual process $\{\varphi_k\}$. In general, it seems that ω_L is not a very close bound for ω, not as close as ω_U at any rate, and neither is $\widetilde{\omega}_L$. We attempt, therefore, to obtain a better lower bound by adding less information. This is doable in the special case of a cyclic environmental process.

Assume that the jump chain $\{\hat{X}_k\}$ follows a deterministic cyclic path, and assume, without loss of generality, that $\hat{X}_k = k \mod m+1$. In this case, (11) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{n,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(n)}] \qquad \text{a.s.} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{nm} \log \mathbb{E}_\rho[\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{nm,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(nm)}, \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(n)}]] \qquad \text{a.s.} \qquad (23)\end{aligned}$$

where the outermost expectation is with respect to $\boldsymbol{\rho}^{(n)}$ defined as $\boldsymbol{\rho}^{(n)} = (\varphi_m, \ldots, \varphi_{(n-1)m})$. That is, in contrast with Theorem 2.3, we do not condition on the whole sequence of states of the dual at the epochs $\{\tau_k\}$ but only at the beginning of cycles for $\{\hat{X}_k\}$.

We redefine as follows the products $\mathcal{Z}_{n,j}$ in (9, 12):

$$\mathcal{Z}_{nm,j} = v_{m,\varphi_0} R_0 R_1 \cdots R_{n-1} v^{-1}_{m,\varphi_{nm}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi_{nm}=j\}},$$

where

$$R_k = \frac{v_{1,\varphi_{km}} v_{2,\varphi_{km+1}} \cdots v_{m,\varphi_{km+m-1}}}{v_{m,\varphi_{km}} v_{1,\varphi_{km+1}} \cdots v_{m-1,\varphi_{km+m-1}}} \tag{24}$$

and we use the fact that $(R_0, R_1, \ldots, R_{k-1})$ is conditionally independent of $(R_k, R_{k+1}, \ldots)$, given φ_{km}. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{Z}_{nm,j} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i, &\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(nm)}, \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(n)}] \\ &= v_{m,i} \prod_{k=0}^{n-2} \mathbb{E}[R_k |\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(nm)}, \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(n)}] \\ &\qquad \mathbb{E}[R_{n-1} v_{m,\varphi_{nm}}^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi_{nm}=j\}} |\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(nm)}, \boldsymbol{\rho}^{(n)}]\end{aligned}$$

which we rewrite as

$$\begin{aligned}&= v_{m,i} \mathbb{E}[R_0 |\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_0, \varphi_m] \prod_{k=1}^{n-2} \mathbb{E}[R_k |\, \varphi_{km}, \varphi_{(k+1)m}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k] \\ &\qquad \mathbb{E}[R_{n-1} v_{m,\varphi_{nm}}^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi_{nm}=j\}} |\, \varphi_{(n-1)m}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{n-1}]\end{aligned}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_k = (\xi_{km}, \xi_{km+1}, \ldots, \xi_{km+m-1})$

$$= f \prod_{k=1}^{n-2} \mathbb{E}[R_k |\, \varphi_{km}, \varphi_{(k+1)m}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k] \tag{25}$$

where we collect in

$$f = v_{m,i} \mathbb{E}[R_0 |\, \varphi_0 = i, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_0, \varphi_m] \mathbb{E}[R_{n-1} v_{m,\varphi_{nm}}^{-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi_{nm}=j\}} |\, \varphi_{(n-1)m}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{n-1}]$$

all the factors which play no role in the limit as $n \to \infty$. Observe that $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_0$, $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_1$, $\ldots$ are independent and identically distributed random m-tuples, with the same distribution as $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^* = (\xi_1^*, \xi_2^*, \ldots, \xi_m^*)$, where ξ_1^*, ξ_2^*, $\ldots$, ξ_m^* are independent, exponentially distributed random variables, respectively with parameters c_1, c_2, $\ldots$, c_m. Thus, from (23) and (25),

$$\begin{aligned}e^{\Psi} &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \{\mathbb{E}_\rho[f \prod_{k=1}^{n-2} \mathbb{E}[R_k |\, \varphi_{km}, \varphi_{(k+1)m}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k]]\}^{1/nm} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_\rho[\lim_{n\to\infty} \{f \prod_{k=1}^{n-2} \mathbb{E}[R_k |\, \varphi_{km}, \varphi_{(k+1)m}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k]\}^{1/nm}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\rho[\lim_{n\to\infty} \{\prod_{k=1}^{n-2} \mathbb{E}[R_k |\, \varphi_{km}, \varphi_{(k+1)m}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k]\}^{1/nm}]; \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

the inequality is justified by Fatou's lemma and Jensen's inequality.

We may now prove the following property.

Theorem 5.1. *A lower bound for ω is given by*

$$\omega_L^* = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} C^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{1 \le i,j \le r} \beta_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\log \mathbb{E}[R_0 | \varphi_0 = i, \varphi_m = j, \boldsymbol{\zeta}^*]], \tag{27}$$

where

$$\beta_{ij} = \alpha_i (N_1 N_2 \cdots N_m)_{ij}, \tag{28}$$

the matrices N_ℓ are defined in (15) and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is the stationary vector of their product:

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} N_1 N_2 \cdots N_m = \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \qquad \boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathbf{1} = 1. \tag{29}$$

Proof. We reorganise the product in (26) and group together the factors with equal values for φ_{km} and $\varphi_{(k+1)m}$, obtaining that

$$e^{\Psi} \ge \mathbb{E}_\rho[\lim_{n\to\infty} (\prod_{1 \le i,j \le r} \prod_{k=1}^{n_{ij}} R_{k;i,j})^{1/nm}] \tag{30}$$

where $n_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi_{mk}=i, \varphi_{m(k+1)}=j\}}$ and, for fixed i and j, $\{R_{1;i,j}, R_{2;i,j}, \ldots\}$ are i.i.d. random variables with the same distribution as $\mathbb{E}[R_0 | \varphi_0 = i, \varphi_m = j, \boldsymbol{\zeta}^*]$.

By the Strong Law of Large Numbers, the limits $\beta_{ij} = \lim_{n\to\infty} n_{ij}/n$ exist and

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{ij} &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{P}[\varphi_{km} = i, \varphi_{(k+1)m} = j] \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{P}[\varphi_{km} = i] \mathbb{P}[\varphi_m = j | \varphi_0 = i] \\ &= \alpha_i (N_1 N_2 \cdots N_m)_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

Further, by the Strong Law of Large Numbers again, for fixed i and j,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} (\prod_{k=1}^{n_{ij}} R_{k;i,j})^{1/n} = \exp(\beta_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\log \mathbb{E}[R_0 | \varphi_0 = i, \varphi_m = j, \boldsymbol{\zeta}^*]])$$

so that the limit in (30) is independent of $\boldsymbol{\rho}^{(n)}$ and the inequality becomes $\Psi \ge \Psi^*$, where

$$\Psi^* = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{1 \le i,j \le r} \beta_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\log \mathbb{E}[R_0 | \varphi_0 = i, \varphi_m = j, \boldsymbol{\zeta}^*]],$$

which proves that (27) is a lower bound for ω.

Now,

$$\Psi^* \geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq r} \beta_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\log R_0 | \varphi_0 = i, \varphi_m = j, \boldsymbol{\zeta}^*]]$$

by Jensen's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq r} \beta_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\log R_0 | \varphi_0 = i, \varphi_m = j] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \alpha_i \mathbb{E}[\log R_0 | \varphi_0 = i]. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

From (24) we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\log R_0 | \varphi_0 = i]] &= \mathbb{E}[\log v_{1,i} + \sum_{\ell=2}^{m} \log v_{\ell,\varphi_{\ell-1}} - \log v_{m,i} - \sum_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \log v_{\ell,\varphi_\ell}] \\ &= (\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell-1} N_t \log \boldsymbol{v}_\ell)_i - \log v_{m,i} - (\sum_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell} N_t \log \boldsymbol{v}_\ell)_i \\ &= (\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell-1} N_t (I - N_\ell) \log \boldsymbol{v}_\ell)_i \end{aligned}$$

and so, by (31),

$$\Psi^* \geq \frac{1}{m} \boldsymbol{\alpha} (\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} \prod_{t=1}^{\ell-1} N_t (I - N_\ell) \log \boldsymbol{v}_\ell). \tag{32}$$

Using the cyclic structure of $\hat{P}$, one shows that the expression $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(1)}(I - N) \log \bar{\boldsymbol{v}}$ defined in Theorem 2.3 is identical to the right-hand side of (32). This proves that $\omega_L^* \geq \omega_L$. □

Denote by A_{ij}, $1 \leq i, j \leq r$, the expectations in (27):

$$A_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[\log \mathbb{E}[R_0 | \varphi_0 = i, \varphi_m = j, \boldsymbol{\zeta}^*]].$$

These need to be determined for ω_L^* to be of practical use. One verifies from first principles that

$$\mathbb{E}[R_0 | \varphi_0, \varphi_m, \boldsymbol{\zeta}^*] = (\prod_{1 \leq k \leq m} \Delta_k^* e^{\Theta_k \xi_k^*})_{\varphi_0, \varphi_m} / (\prod_{1 \leq k \leq m} e^{\Theta_k \xi_k^*})_{\varphi_0, \varphi_m}$$

where $\Delta_1^* = \Delta_1 \Delta_m^{-1}$ and $\Delta_k^* = \Delta_k \Delta_{k-1}^{-1}$, $k = 2, \ldots, m$, so that

$$A_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[\log(\prod_{1 \le k \le m} \Delta_k^* e^{\Theta_k \xi_k^*})_{ij}] - \mathbb{E}[\log(\prod_{1 \le k \le m} e^{\Theta_k \xi_k^*})_{ij}].$$

Although we do not have an explicit form for the expectations above, estimations by simulation are easily obtained, and this is what we did to compare ω_L^* and ω_L in the two examples below.

Example 5.2 (Continuation of Example 4.1). The random environment of Example 4.1 has only two states and is automatically cyclic. The new lower bound is $\omega_L^* = 0.6577$ and is indeed larger than $\omega_L = 0.6107$.

Example 5.3 (A three-state cyclic random environment). This is similar to Example 4.2: it is a three-state random environment with matrices Ω_ℓ defined in (21, 22); the cyclic generator is

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} -4 & 4 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 6 & 0 & -6 \end{bmatrix},$$

and the stationary distribution is $\boldsymbol{\pi} = [0.1765, 0.7059, 0.1176]$. The bounds and the approximation are given in the table below

$\widetilde{\omega}_L$	ω_L	ω_L^*	ω_{sim}	ω_U
0.1494	0.3480	0.3906	0.4218	0.4250

We see that in both examples, the difference $\omega_{sim} - \omega_L^*$ is less than half the difference $\omega_{sim} - \omega_L$. Needless to say, we might apply the same procedure to the dual of Section 3, thereby obtaining another lower bound, closer to ω than $\widetilde{\omega}_L$. In the same manner as there is no systematic difference between $\widetilde{\omega}_L$ and ω_L, we do not expect that there would be a systematic preference between this additional bound and ω_L^*.

6 Tightness of the bounds

The bounds are tight in that there exist branching processes for which the bounds are all equal and equal to ω. We show below that such is the case for single-type processes ($r = 1$), and for processes such that the matrices Ω_ℓ commute for all ℓ; it is in particular the case for processes with constant growth rate ($\Omega_\ell = \Omega$ for all ℓ, for some Ω).

Lemma 6.1. *If $r = 1$, then $\omega_L = \widetilde{\omega}_L = \omega_L^* = \omega_U = \omega = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} C^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$.*

Proof. If $r = 1$, all matrices reduce to scalars, so that $\lambda_\ell = \Omega_\ell$ and $\Omega_\ell^* = 0$ for all ℓ. Therefore, $\Psi = 0$ by (6) and $\omega = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} C^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ by (10).

Furthermore, $M_\ell = 1$ for all ℓ, so that $M(\hat{P} \otimes I) = \hat{P}$ is a stochastic matrix and $\log \mathrm{sp}[M(\hat{P} \otimes I)] = 0$. We have thus proved that $\omega_U = \omega$.

Finally, $\Theta_\ell = 0$, so that $N_\ell = 1$, for all ℓ. Therefore, $I - N = 0$ and we conclude that $\omega_L = \omega$. The same argument gives us $\widetilde{\omega}_L = \omega$. Since $\omega_L \leq \omega_L^* \leq \omega$, this shows that $\omega_L^* = \omega$ as well. □

Lemma 6.2. *If the matrices Ω_ℓ are mutually commutative for all $1 \leq \ell \leq m$, then $\omega_L = \widetilde{\omega}_L = \omega_L^* = \omega_U = \omega = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} C^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$.*

Proof. Once more, it is enough to prove that $\mathrm{sp}[M(\hat{P} \otimes I)] = 1$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(1)}(I - N) = 0$. Note that since the matrices Ω_ℓ are mutually commutative for all ℓ, their all share the same strictly positive Perron-Frobenius right-eigenvector, that we denote by $\boldsymbol{v}$. Let λ_ℓ denote the eigenvalue of maximal real part of Ω_ℓ. Then the matrices M_ℓ defined in (13) are such that

$$\begin{aligned} M_\ell \boldsymbol{v} &= c_\ell ((c_\ell + \lambda_\ell) I - \Omega_\ell)^{-1} \boldsymbol{v} \\ &= c_\ell (c_\ell + \lambda_\ell - \lambda_\ell)^{-1} \boldsymbol{v} \\ &= \boldsymbol{v}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$M(\hat{P} \otimes I)(\mathbf{1} \otimes \boldsymbol{v}) = M(\mathbf{1} \otimes \boldsymbol{v}) = \mathbf{1} \otimes \boldsymbol{v},$$

and since $\mathbf{1} \otimes \boldsymbol{v} > \mathbf{0}$, this proves that $\mathrm{sp}[M(\hat{P} \otimes I)] = 1$ by the Perron-Frobenius Theorem.

Second, the mutual commutativity of the matrices Ω_ℓ implies the mutual commutitivity of the matrices Θ_ℓ, and we denote by $\boldsymbol{w}$ the common strictly positive left-eigenvector of the matrices Θ_ℓ associated to their dominant eigenvalue 0, normalized such that $\boldsymbol{w}\mathbf{1} = 1$. The matrices N_ℓ defined in (15) are then such that

$$\boldsymbol{w} N_\ell = c_\ell \boldsymbol{w} (c_\ell I - \Theta_\ell)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{w}$$

for all ℓ, and so

$$(\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \otimes \boldsymbol{w}) N (\hat{P} \otimes I) = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \otimes \boldsymbol{w})(\hat{P} \otimes I) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \otimes \boldsymbol{w}.$$

We conclude, on the one hand, that $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(1)} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \otimes \boldsymbol{w}$ and, on the other hand, that $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(1)}(I - N) = \mathbf{0}$. □

Acknowledgements

Sophie Hautphenne is supported by the Australian Research Council (ARC) grant DP110101663. Guy Latouche acknowledges the support of the Ministère de la Communauté française de Belgique through the ARC grant AUWB-08/13–ULB 5.

References

[1] K. Athreya and S. Karlin. On branching processes with random environments: I: Extinction probabilities. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 5:1499–1520, 1971.

[2] K. B. Athreya and P. E. Ney. *Branching Processes*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972.

[3] E. Bolthausen and I. Goldsheid. Recurrence and transience of random walks in random environments on a strip. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 214(2):429–447, 2000.

[4] H. Furstenberg and H. Kesten. Products of random matrices. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 31:457–469, 1960.

[5] R. Gharavi and V. Anantharam. An upper bound for the largest Lyapunov exponent of a Markovian random matrix product of nonnegative matrices. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 332:543–557, 2005.

[6] S. Hautphenne, G. Latouche, and G. T. Nguyen. Markovian trees subject to catastrophes: would they survive forever? In *Matrix-Analytic Methods in Stochastic Models*, pages 87–106. Springer, 2013.

[7] E. Key. Computable examples of the maximal Lyapunov exponent. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields*, 75:97–107, 1987.

[8] E. Key. Lower bounds for the maximal Lyapunov exponent. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 3(3):477–488, 1987.

[9] J. F. C. Kingman. Subadditive ergodic theory. *The Annals of Probability*, 1:883–909, 1973.

[10] R. Lima and M. Rahibe. Exact Lyapunov exponent for infinite products of random matrices. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 27:3427–3437, 1994.

[11] V. I. Oseledec. A multiplicative ergodic theorem: Lyapunov characteristic numbers for dynamical systems. *Trans. Moscow Math. Soc.*, 19:197–231, 1968.

[12] D. Tanny. On multitype branching processes in a random environment. *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, 13:464–497, 1981.

[13] J. Tsitsiklis and V. Blondel. The Lyapunov exponent and joint spectral radius of pairs of matrices are hard — when not impossible — to compute and to approximate. *Math. Control Signals Systems*, 10:31–40, 1997.

[14] J. C. Watkins. Limit theorems for products of random matrices. In J. E. Cohen, H. Kesten, and C. M. Newman, editors, *Random Matrices and Their Applications*, volume 50 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 5–22. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1986.